


submit that the Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn because examination of all claims does not result in an undue burden. Claims 1-30, although amended during prosecution, have been present since the application was filed and have been examined a number of times. Moreover, claims 31 and 32 have been examined and were not substantively amended since examination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Restriction Requirement and continue to examine all claims as there is no serious burden to the Examiner. See MPEP § 811.

If the Examiner refuses to withdraw the Restriction Requirement, Applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications directed to the unelected claims of the revised Invention II.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP**

By:   
Mary Jane Boswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: May 26, 2005

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: 202.739.3000